Subject: Chat with Dan COLLINS
From: Dan COLLINS <vermontaigne@gmail.com>
To: barriticus@gmail.com

me: yep
Dan: It's all puff.
me: ah, yes
Dan: Seconds, meet by the river at dawn, choice of weapons . . .
me: was referring to incident with Charleston Gazette
me: not sure, what's that?
Dan: He's having fun with that.
Dan: Are you talking about his duello thing?
me: and I don't threaten people
me: but I get libeled twice before breakfast each morning
me: That's understandable
Dan: Disturbed? Well, he's tired of being libelled, I guess.
me: is threatening this newspaper over and over again
me: he seems to be disturbed
Dan: Sure, my pleasure.
Dan: LOL
me: thanks again for your input thus far, by the way
me: am delaying the planned follow-ups as I've got to deal with Stacy McCain now
Dan: Good.
me: I'm happy with how it turned out
me: howdy
Dan: How'd the article go, Barrett?
me: and for many of the same reasons
me: well, you probably know that I take a very critical position on many of these same people
Dan: Very strange.
Dan: I don't think he knows the difference anymore, he's so egocentric.
me: do you think he's being dishonest, or is simply mistaken?
Dan: He's like Dante: a party of one. Only, without the intelligence or chops.
Dan: He's lost half his readership in the past year.
Dan: There appear to be one or two sycophants who follow him, still.
Dan: In other words, he's melted down.
me: has he turned on everyone, then?
Dan: He's decided that anyone not Charles needs purging.
me: I don't follow those conflicts closely, vaguely aware that CJ is persona non grata due to what he's said about a lot of other conservative bloggers
Dan: and his weird lizard army
Dan: No, I didn't. I think he's particularly sick of Charles, though.

me: at any rate, I'm writing another one
me: but did you see my article on him a few weeks back?
me: In fact, I can't remember the last time I did
me: I don't usually go around calling people racist
me: well
Dan: I think he's sick of being called one.
Dan: But . . . he's not a racist.
Dan: Hmmm. I'll give you the odd duck thing.
me: just an odd duck in general
me: he also made a strange reference to Biblical violence regarding my PAC
Dan: And by a lot of people, all accusing each other of the same things.
me: it's best to avoid that and stick to demonstrable facts, indeed. The armchair psychology is obviously used against quite a few people
Dan: It's a way of dismissing everyone who disagrees as "insane"
Dan: sidney did
Dan: I hate the psychologizing, too
Dan: Including, obviously, ideology
me: understood
Dan: People make fundamentalisms out of all kinds of things, Barrett.
me: and some ways lead to tyranny
me: a person can interpret a winged horse in many ways
me: Well, perhaps you should
Dan: Agreed. But I'm not concerned whether someone believes Muhammed rode on a winged horse
me: to the extent that both are based on ideology and not methodology
me: both are potentially dangerous to the foundations of science
Dan: To institutions that aren't very . . . well, concerned about the US
me: understood and agreed
Dan: Including a loss of sovereignty
Dan: Because that effects policies in a direct way.
Dan: As a matter of practicality, it's more important to me to know whether someone believes in global warming, despite the evidence to the contrary . . .
me: I know
Dan: Fair enough, but Charles can't stop being offended by it, wherever it arises.
me: no, it doesn't bother me. But it does make it difficult for me to respect one's mind if they've taken what I believe to be a very flawed position on a matter of importance
Dan: True, but does it keep you up at night knowing that someone is a creationist?
Dan: Hasta luego
Dan: I'll look, and look for you later.
me: very well, adios
Dan: I'm going to go feed monsterlings.
me: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/barrett-brown/robert-mccain-fine-with-p_b_290261.html

Dan: Sure.
me: I'd like to have your thoughts on this article, actually, in case I'm missing something or am overstating the case without realizing it
me: Stacy McCain, for instance,
me: rightfully or wrongly
me: if a man thinks A is okay in terms X, but not in terms of Y, then we can tell that there's something about Y that troubles him
me: regarding the issue of A
me: for instance
me: yes. But there is a point at which one can make a reasoned determination about another's thoughts